

# **Department of the Air Force**

## **Summary of Selection Process**

---

### **Department of the Air Force Selection Process**

The Air Force 1993 selection process is essentially the same as was used in 1991. The Secretary of the Air Force appointed a Base Closure Executive Group of seven general officers and six comparable (Senior Executive Service) career civilians. Areas of expertise included environment; facilities and construction; finance; law; logistics; programs; operations; personnel and training; reserve components; and research, development and acquisition. The group met regularly from November 1992 to March 1993. Additionally, an Air Staff Base Closure Working Group was formed to provide staff support and detailed expertise to the Executive Group. General officers from the Plans and Programs offices of the Major Commands (MAJCOM) met on several occasions with the Executive Group. They provided mission specific expertise and greater base-level detail where necessary. Also, potential cross-service utilization was identified by a special interservice working group.

The Executive Group developed a base closure Internal Control Plan which was approved by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Production and Logistics) and the DoD Inspector General. This plan provides structure and guidance for all participants in the base closure process, including procedures for data gathering and certification.

The Executive Group reviewed all Active and Air Reserve Component (ARC) installations in the United States which met or exceeded the Section 2687, Title 10 U.S.C. threshold of 300 direct-hire civilians authorized to be employed. A comprehensive and detailed questionnaire was developed to gather data. The questionnaire was sent to each applicable base and the data was validated by each base, Major Command and the Air Staff. All data were evaluated and certified in accordance with the Internal Control Plan. As an additional control measure, the Air Force Audit Agency was tasked to review the Air Force process for consistency with the law and DoD policy and to ensure that the data collection and validation process was adequate.

A capacity analysis was also performed, including actual on-site surveys at 48 bases which evaluated the capability of a base to accommodate additional force structure and other activities (excess capacity) beyond what was programmed to be stationed at the base.

The Executive Group frequently challenged data based on their own substantial knowledge and experience. Additionally, more detailed, or corrected data were provided where appropriate. All data used in the preparation and submission of information and recommendations concerning the closure or realignment of military installations were certified as to accuracy and completeness by appropriate officials at the base, MAJCOM, and Headquarters level. In addition, the Executive Group and the acting Secretary of the Air Force certified that all information used to support the recommendations was accurate and complete to the best of their knowledge and belief. The results of the excess capacity analysis were used in conjunction with the approved DoD Force Structure Plan in determining base structure requirements. Also, the capacity analysis was used to identify cost effective opportunities to beddown activities and aircraft dislocated from bases recommended for closure or realignment.

The Secretary of the Air Force determined that further study was not needed for bases the Executive Group deemed mission essential or geographically key. The Executive Group then placed all the remaining bases in four categories based on the installation's predominant use. Capacity was analyzed by category based on a study of current base capacity and the future requirements imposed by the DoD Force Structure Plan. Some categories or subcategories were found to have no excess capacity and the Secretary of the Air Force determined that further study of these bases was not warranted. Categories or subcategories having some excess capacity but unreasonable cost to relocate or replicate essential continuing functions were also eliminated from further study.

All Active Component bases in the remaining categories were individually examined on the basis of the eight selection criteria established by the Secretary of Defense, and over 160 Air Force unique subelements which were developed by the Air Force to provide specific data points for each criterion.

The Air Reserve Component (ARC) category, comprised of Air National Guard (ANG) and Air Force Reserve (AFRES) bases, warrants further explanation. First, these bases do not readily compete against each other as ARC units enjoy a special relationship with their respective states and local communities. In fact, relocating Guard units across state boundaries is not a practical alternative. We must also give careful consideration of the recruiting needs of these units. Second, the DoD Force Structure Plan does not reduce the ARC force structure, so there is no apparent excess base structure and this category could have been excluded from further consideration. However, realignment of ARC units onto active installations or onto other ARC installations could prove cost effective. Therefore, the ARC category was examined for cost effective realignments to other bases.

Information, base groupings, and options resulting from the Executive Group analyses were presented to the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff, in person, by the Executive Group on a number of occasions. Based on the DoD force structure plan and the final criteria, with consideration given to excess capacity, efficiencies in base utilization and evolving concepts of basing the force, the acting Secretary of the Air Force, with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff, and in consultation with the Base Closure Executive Group, selected the bases recommended for closure and realignment.



# **Department of the Air Force**

## **Recommendations and Justifications**

---

### **Homestead Air Force Base, Florida**

**Recommendation:** Homestead AFB, Florida, is recommended for closure. The 31st Fighter Wing will inactivate. All F-16s from the 31st Fighter Wing will remain temporarily assigned to Moody AFB, Georgia, and Shaw AFB, South Carolina. The Inter-American Air Forces Academy will move to Lackland AFB, Texas. The Air Force Water Survival School will be temporarily located at Tyndall AFB, Florida. Future disposition of the Water Survival School is dependent upon efforts to consolidate its functions with the US Navy. The 301st Rescue Squadron, Air Force Reserve (AFRES) will move to Patrick AFB, Florida. The 482nd Fighter Wing (AFRES) will move to MacDill AFB, Florida and convert to KC-135Rs. The NORAD alert activity will move to an alternate location. The 726th Air Control Squadron will relocate to Shaw AFB. The Naval Security Group will consolidate with other US Navy units. All DoD activities and facilities including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base exchange facilities will close. All essential cleanup and restoration activities associated with Hurricane Andrew will continue until completed. If Homestead AFB resumes operations as a civilian airport, the NORAD alert facility may be rebuilt in a cantonment area.

**Justification:** There were several factors which resulted in the closure recommendation. First, the Air Force has one more small aircraft base than is required to support the fighter aircraft in the DoD Force Structure Plan. When the data were evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria, Homestead AFB ranked low relative to the other bases in the small aircraft subcategory. While Homestead AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, one stood out: the excessive cost to rebuild Homestead, while other small aircraft bases required little or no new investment. The cost to close Homestead AFB is low, especially when measured against the high cost of reconstruction, and the long-term savings are substantial.

All small aircraft bases were considered equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, and the Department of Defense (DOD) guidance. Bases were evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of

the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (Executive Group), a group of seven general officers and six Senior Executive Service career civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close Homestead AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the Executive Group.

**Return on Investment:** The cost to close is estimated to be \$75.1 million; the annual savings after closure are \$75.4 million; the return on investment years based on the net present value computations is 0 years. All dollar amounts are in constant FY 94 dollars.

**Impacts:** The Air Force will dispose of all property at Homestead AFB except a small parcel that may be needed for a NORAD alert facility. The closure of Homestead AFB will have an impact on the local economy. The projected potential employment loss, both direct and indirect, is 1.0 percent of the employment base in the Miami-Hialeah Metropolitan Statistical Area, assuming no economic recovery. The impact on the city of Homestead, Florida will be much more severe. Homestead AFB is in an air quality non-attainment area for ozone, and has significant soil contamination from fuels, lead, and pesticides. Homestead AFB is on the National Priorities List. Closure of Homestead AFB will result in generally positive environmental effects. Environmental restoration of Homestead AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at receiving bases is not significant.

#### **K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan**

**Recommendation:** K.I. Sawyer AFB, Michigan, is recommended for closure. The 410th Wing will inactivate. B-52H aircraft will transfer to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana. The Air Force will retire its B-52G aircraft instead of implementing the previous Base Closure Commission recommendation to transfer those aircraft from Castle AFB, California, to K.I. Sawyer AFB.

**Justification:** There are several factors which resulted in the above recommendation. The Air Force has four more large aircraft bases than are needed to support the number of bombers, tankers, and airlift assets in the DoD Force Structure Plan. The Air Force must maintain Minuteman III basing flexibility due to uncertainty with respect to START II. This requires the retention of the ballistic missile fields at Malmstrom AFB, Grand Forks AFB, Minot AFB, and F.E. Warren AFB. It is more economical to retain a bomber/missile base that must remain open for missiles than to maintain a bomber-only base. Therefore, based on the facts that K.I. Sawyer AFB

does not support ballistic missile operations, that when all eight DoD criteria are applied K.I. Sawyer AFB ranks low, and that there is excess large aircraft base capacity, K.I. Sawyer AFB is recommended for closure.

All large aircraft bases were considered equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, and the Department of Defense (DoD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Extensive data gathered to support the evaluation of each base under each criterion was reviewed by the Base Closure Executive Group (Executive Group), a group of seven general officers and six Senior Executive Service career civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to close K.I. Sawyer AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the Executive Group.

**Return on Investment:** The cost to close is estimated to be \$143.7 million; the annual savings after closure are \$62.4 million; the return on investment years based on the net present value computations is 1 year. All dollar amounts are in constant FY 94 dollars.

**Impacts:** The closure of K.I. Sawyer AFB will have an impact on the local economy. The projected potential employment loss, both direct and indirect, is 14 percent of the employment base in the Marquette County Metropolitan Statistical Area, assuming no economic recovery. Closure of K.I. Sawyer will result in generally positive environmental effects. There is no significant environmental impact resulting from this closure. Environmental restoration of K.I. Sawyer AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at receiving bases is not significant.

### **Newark Air Force Base, Ohio**

**Recommendation:** Newark AFB, Ohio, is recommended for closure. The Aerospace Guidance and Metrology Center (AGMC) depot will be closed; some workload will move to other depot maintenance activities including the private sector. We anticipate that most will be privatized in place.

**Justification:** Due to significant reductions in force structure, the Air Force has an excess depot maintenance capacity of at least 8.7 million Direct Product Actual Hours (DPAH). When all eight criteria are applied to the bases in the depot subcategory, Newark AFB ranked low in comparison to the other five depot bases. The long-term military value of the base is low because it does not have an airfield and it is not a

traditional Air Force base in any respect. Instead, it is a stand-alone, highly technical, industrial plant that is operated predominantly by a civilian work force. As a result, it is conducive to conversion to the private sector. The closure of Newark AFB will reduce the Air Force excess depot capacity by 1.7 million DPAH and is consistent with OSD guidance to reduce excess capacity, economize depot management, and increase competition and privatization in DoD.

All six Air Force depots were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, and Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base hosting an Air Force depot was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases, depots, and missions. Extensive data, gathered to support the evaluation of these bases under each criterion, was reviewed by the Base Closure Executive Group (Executive Group). The Executive Group is a group of seven general officers and six Senior Executive Service career civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force (SECAF). SECAF made the decision to close Newark AFB with the advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the Executive Group.

**Return on Investment:** The cost to close is estimated to be \$31.3 million; the annual savings after closure are \$3.8 million; the return on investment years based on the net present value computations is 8 years. All dollar amounts are in constant FY 94 dollars.

**Impacts:** The closure of Newark AFB will have an impact on the local economy. The projected potential employment loss, both direct and indirect, is 4.6 percent of the employment base in the Licking County Metropolitan Statistical Area, assuming no economic recovery. Newark AFB is in an air quality non-attainment area for ozone. Closure of Newark AFB will result in generally positive environmental effects. Environmental restoration of Newark AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at receiving bases is not significant.



**Community Preference Consideration in Closure and  
Realignment of Military Installations  
Section 2924. Public Law 101-510**

**O'Hare International Airport, Air Force Reserve Station, Illinois**

**Community Proposal:** The City of Chicago has exercised its right under Section 2924 of P.L. 101-510 to propose that the O'Hare Air Reserve Station (ARS) be closed and the flying units moved to a new facility to be constructed at Rockford, Illinois. This provision of law mandates the Department give special consideration to the proposal. The City desires to acquire the property for aviation-related commercial use.

**Recommendation:** Close O'Hare ARS as proposed by the City of Chicago and relocate the assigned Air Reserve Component (ARC) units to the Greater Rockford Airport, or another location acceptable to the Secretary of the Air Force, provided the City can demonstrate that it has the financing in place to cover the full cost of replacing facilities, moving, and environmental cleanup, without any cost whatsoever to the federal government and that the closure/realignment must begin by July 1995 and be completed by July 1997. Chicago would also have to fund the full cost of relocating the Army Reserve activity, or leave it in place. If these conditions are not met, the units should remain at O'Hare International Airport.

**Justification:** O'Hare Reserve Station is in the Northwest corner of O'Hare International Airport, enjoying immediate access to two runways. Two ARC units are based there: the 928th Airlift Group (Air Force Reserve), with C-130s; and the 126th Air Refueling Wing (Air National Guard), with KC-135s. An Army Reserve Center is located adjacent to the base. In addition, a large Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) activity currently occupies a government owned, recently renovated office building on the base; however, DLA is recommending disestablishment of this activity to other locations as part of the 1993 base closure process.

In a 1991 land exchange agreement, intended to resolve all real property issues between the Air Force and the City of Chicago at O'Hare International Airport, the City specifically agreed that it would seek no more land from the O'Hare ARS. The Air Force has advised the City that the ARC units are adequately housed at O'Hare, and there is no basis for moving them. There are no savings from moving; only costs. To justify this realignment under the DoD Base Closure Selection Criteria, all costs of closure/realignment would have to be funded entirely outside the federal government. (For example, no DoD or FAA funds). The relocation site would have to meet all

operating requirements, such as runway length and freedom from noise-related operating limitations, and be close enough to Chicago that the units would not suffer major loss of personnel. The day-to-day operating costs at the relocation site would have to compare favorably with those at O'Hare International Airport.

The City proposes that the ARC units move to Greater Rockford Airport, 55 miles northwest of O'Hare International Airport. Virtually no facilities for the units exist at Rockford, so an entirely new base would have to be constructed. The airfield is constrained on two sides by the Rock River and flood plain. At least one runway will have to be extended for KC-135 operations. There appear to be noise and other environmental problems to resolve before a final determination of siting feasibility can be made.

**Return on Investment:** The COBRA model estimates that the cost to close is \$361 million. This estimate is based on the City of Chicago consultant's estimate of construction costs at Rockford, and normal COBRA estimating factors for other costs. There are no apparent savings to offset this cost.

The proceeds from disposal of the real property, which might offset some of the cost, are difficult to estimate. If the airport property were sold at fair market value, the estimated proceeds would be about \$33 million. The buildings may or may not be of use to a buyer. While some are new and all are usable for their current military use, their value to a commercial or civil aviation user are questionable. Demolition and disposal are estimated by the City's consultant to cost \$25 million, which would be an offset to the land value. However, most of the O'Hare ARS qualifies as aviation-related property, which the City could obtain in a no-cost public benefit transfer under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, 50 U.S.C. App. 1622. The building, to be vacated by DLA is severable from the Reserve Base and does not appear to be aviation property. The net cost to close and realign is estimated to be in a range from \$328 million to \$361 million. Since there are no savings in operational or other costs, the payback period is infinity.

The Air Force analysis of the proposal assuming Chicago or some other non-Federal source pays the full cost is as follows. The facilities at O'Hare ARS are adequate, with many new or recently renovated buildings. The recruiting base, the Chicago metropolitan area, is outstanding. There are no serious constraints on mission accomplishment, other than some air traffic control delays due to the dense commercial traffic. However, alert or other time-sensitive missions are not flown from O'Hare

ARS. Since the base is adequate for its purpose, no savings would accrue from closing it. The aircraft remain in the force structure plan and the units are not planned for inactivation. In the case of the ANG, the governor's consent would be required to disband. Thus, closure of the base requires that both units be realigned.

The military value of an ARC base at Rockford, fully built up with all the necessary facilities, still does not exceed that of O'Hare. For retention of the mostly part-time ARC personnel it is not as good, due to the distance from the homes of currently assigned personnel. Some personnel losses and retraining must be anticipated, effecting unit readiness and adding to the cost. It is not clear that the Rockford area alone can provide a steady stream of volunteers large enough to man two large ARC units. Recruiting from Chicago will still be required, but will be much harder due to the distance differential between O'Hare and Rockford.

Although the City of Chicago had previously stated that they did not expect the Air Force to fund relocation and facility replacement costs, the City has been unable to guarantee that it will pay the full cost of moving. However, in its most recent correspondence, the City has made the following commitment, "At this time, we wish to commit that all costs associated with our plan will be at no cost to the Department of Defense and that the City of Chicago, together with the host airport, will provide suitable replacement facilities on either a square foot for square foot basis or with more cost efficient functionally equivalent facilities. This commitment of full cost coverage is contingent upon securing necessary financing, which we continue to pursue, and the approval of our governing council body."

Acceptance of this proposal must be based on benefits to the City of Chicago. The proposed move would make some considerable space available for airport related activities at this intensively used air carrier airport. Therefore, if the City of Chicago could demonstrate: that it has financing in place to cover the full cost of replacing facilities, moving and environmental cleanup, without any cost whatsoever to the federal government; that the closure/realignment could begin by July 1995, as required by Section 2904(a)(3) of the Defense Base Closure and realignment Act of 1990, and that the relocation could be completed by July 1997; the Air Force would not object to the proposal. The City would also have to fund the full cost of relocating the Army Reserve activity, or leave it in place. If these conditions are not met, the units should remain at O'Hare International Airport.

### **March Air Force Base, California**

**Recommendation:** March AFB, California, is recommended for realignment. The 22nd Air Refueling Wing will inactivate. The KC-10 (Active and Associate Reserve) aircraft will be relocated to Travis AFB, California. The Southwest Air Defense Sector will remain at March in a cantonment area pending the outcome of a NORAD sector consolidation study. If the sector remains it will be transferred to the Air National Guard (ANG). The 445th Airlift Wing Air Force Reserve (AFRES), 452nd Air Refueling Wing (AFRES), 163rd Reconnaissance Group (ANG) (becomes an Air Refueling Group), the Air Force Audit Agency, and the Media Center (from Norton AFB, California) will remain and the base will convert to a reserve base. Additionally, the Army Corps of Engineers Unit, the US Customs Aviation Operation Center West, and the Drug Enforcement Agency aviation unit will remain.

**Justification:** There are several factors which resulted in the above recommendation. First, the Air Force has four more large aircraft bases than needed to support the number of bombers, tankers, and airlift assets in the DoD Force Structure Plan. Also, when all eight DoD criteria were applied to the large aircraft bases, March AFB ranked low. The Air Force plans to establish a large air mobility base (KC-10, C-5 and C-141 aircraft) on the west coast. When bases in the region (Beale AFB, California; Fairchild AFB, Washington; March AFB, California; McChord AFB, Washington; Malmstrom AFB, Montana; Travis AFB, California) were analyzed for this mission, Travis AFB ranked highest. March AFB currently requires a large active duty component to support a relatively small active duty force structure. The conversion of March AFB to a reserve base achieves substantial savings and the benefit of a large recruiting population for the Air Force Reserve is retained.

All large aircraft bases were considered equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, and the Department of Defense (DoD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Extensive data, gathered to support the evaluation of each base under each criterion was reviewed by the Base Closure Executive Group (Executive Group), a group of seven general officers and six Senior Executive Service career civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to realign March AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the Executive Group.

**Return on Investment:** The cost to realign is estimated to be \$134.8 million; the annual savings after realignment are \$46.9 million; the return on investment years based on the net present value computations is 2 years. All dollar amounts are in constant FY 94 dollars.

**Impacts:** The Air Force will dispose of all property not required within the revised boundaries of the reserve base and welcome joint use of the airfield with civil aviation or conversion to a civilian airport. The realignment of March AFB will have an impact on the local economy. The projected potential employment loss, both direct and indirect, is 1.6 percent of the employment base in the Riverside County Metropolitan Statistical Area, assuming no economic recovery. The realignment of March AFB will result in generally positive environmental effects. March AFB is in an air quality non-attainment area for ozone, carbon-monoxide, nitric-oxide, and particulates. Threatened and endangered species and critical habitat are present on-base. March AFB is on the National Priorities List. Environmental restoration of March AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at receiving bases is not significant.

#### **McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey**

**Recommendation:** McGuire AFB, New Jersey, is recommended for realignment. The 438th Airlift Wing will inactivate. Most of the C-141s will transfer to Plattsburgh AFB, New York. Fourteen C-141s will remain and transfer to the Air Force Reserve. The 514th Airlift Wing Air Force Reserve (AFRES), the 170th Air Refueling Group Air National Guard (ANG), and the 108th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain and the base will convert to a Reserve base. The 913th Airlift Group (AFRES) will relocate from Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Pennsylvania, to McGuire AFB. The Air Force Reserve will operate the base.

**Justification:** There are several factors which result in the above recommendation. First of all, the Air Force has four more large aircraft bases than are needed to support the number of bombers, tankers, and airlift assets in the DoD Force Structure Plan. When all eight DoD criteria were applied, McGuire AFB ranked low when compared to the other bases in its category. Also, when McGuire AFB was compared specifically with other airlift bases, it still ranked low.

The Air Force plans to establish a large mobility base in the Northeast to support the new Major Regional Contingency (MRC) strategy. McGuire AFB was evaluated specifically as the location for this wing. Along with other bases that met the geographical criteria and were available for this mission are Griffiss AFB, New

York and Plattsburgh AFB, New York. Plattsburgh AFB ranked best in capability to support the air mobility wing due to its geographical location, attributes, and base loading capacity. Principal mobility attributes include aircraft parking space (for 70-80 tanker/airlift aircraft), fuel hydrants and fuel supply/storage capacity, along with present and future encroachment and airspace considerations.

When Plattsburgh AFB was compared directly with McGuire AFB, Plattsburgh AFB rated better in all of the mobility attributes. An air mobility wing at Plattsburgh AFB will eliminate many of the problems associated with operating at McGuire AFB, in the midst of the New York/New Jersey air traffic congestion. Basing the additional aircraft of an air mobility wing at McGuire AFB will add to that congestion. Plattsburgh AFB, on the other hand, has ample airspace for present and future training by an air mobility wing. Also, the FAA has long expressed a desire for civil use of McGuire AFB, which will ease the congestion at other airfields and terminal facilities in the New York and Philadelphia metropolitan areas. For these reasons, McGuire AFB was recommended for realignment and conversion to an Air Force Reserve Base.

The Air Reserve Component (ARC) forces at McGuire AFB represent a significant portion of the air refueling and airlift forces stationed there and they are well located for recruiting. By keeping the airfield open for military use, the parking and fuel handling capacity at McGuire AFB remains available in future contingencies. The existing programmed Military Construction funds for the ANG KC-135 conversion will be used to establish the ARC cantonment at McGuire AFB.

The Air Force encourages conversion of the airfield to a civil airport. The ARC units will remain as tenants if McGuire AFB becomes a civil airfield. Civil operation will enhance the value of the base to the community and encourage reuse of the facilities not needed by the reserve units, and create jobs. It will also reduce the cost to the Air Force of operating its units at McGuire AFB.

All large aircraft bases were considered equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, and the Department of Defense (DoD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Extensive data, gathered to support the evaluation of each base under each criterion was reviewed by the Base Closure Executive Group (Executive Group), a group of seven general officers and six Senior Executive Service career civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to realign McGuire AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the Executive Group.

**Return on Investment:** The cost to realign is estimated to be \$197.5 million; the annual savings after realignment are \$47.5 million; the return on investment years based on the net present value computations is 4 years. All dollar amounts are in constant FY 94 dollars.

**Impacts:** The Air Force will dispose of all property outside the reduced base boundary and consider joint use of the airfield with civil aviation or conversion to a civil airport. The realignment of McGuire AFB will have an impact on the local economy. The projected potential employment loss, both direct and indirect, is 3.5 percent of the employment base in the Burlington County Metropolitan Statistical Area, assuming no economic recovery. There is moderate impact on community housing and the medical community at the new receiving base; however, this impact will be mitigated by Air Force constructed housing and an expansion of the base medical capabilities. McGuire AFB is in an air quality non-attainment area for ozone and is on the National Priorities List. The realignment of McGuire AFB will result in generally positive environmental effects. Environmental restoration of McGuire AFB will continue until complete.

#### **Griffiss Air Force Base, New York**

**Recommendation:** Griffiss AFB, New York, is recommended for realignment. The 416th Bomb Wing will inactivate. The B-52H aircraft will transfer to Minot AFB, North Dakota, and Barksdale AFB, Louisiana. The KC-135 aircraft from Griffiss AFB will transfer to Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota. The 485th Engineering Installation Group at Griffiss AFB will relocate to Hill AFB, Utah.

The Northeast Air Defense Sector will remain at Griffiss in a cantonment area pending the outcome of a NORAD sector consolidation study. If the sector remains it will be transferred to the Air National Guard (ANG). Rome Laboratory will remain at Griffiss AFB in its existing facilities as a stand-alone Air Force laboratory. A minimum essential airfield will be maintained and operated by a contractor on an "as needed, on call" basis. The ANG will maintain and operate necessary facilities to support mobility/contingency/training of the 10th Infantry (Light) Division located at Fort Drum, New York, and operate them when needed. Only the stand-alone laboratory and the ANG mission will remain.

**Justification:** The Air Force has four more large aircraft bases than needed to support the number of bombers, tankers, and airlift assets in the DoD Force Structure Plan. When all eight DoD criteria are applied, Griffiss AFB ranked low compared to the other large aircraft bases. Based on this analysis, the application of all eight DoD selection criteria, and excess capacity which results from reduced force structure, Griffiss AFB is recommended for realignment.

The Air Force plans to establish a large air mobility base in the Northeast to support the new Major Regional Contingency (MRC) strategy. Griffiss AFB was evaluated specifically as the location for this wing, along with other bases that met the geographical criteria and were available for this mission: McGuire AFB, New Jersey and Plattsburgh AFB, New York. Plattsburgh AFB ranked best in capability to support the air mobility wing due to its geographical location, attributes and base loading capacity. Principal mobility attributes include aircraft parking space (for 70-80 tanker/airlift aircraft), fuel hydrants and fuel supply/storage capacity, along with present and future encroachment and airspace considerations.

The Rome Laboratory has a large civilian work force and is located in adequate facilities that can be separated from the rest of Griffiss AFB. It does not need to be closed or realigned as a result of the reductions in the rest of the base.

All large aircraft bases were considered equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, and the Department of Defense (DoD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Extensive data, gathered to support the evaluation of each base under each criterion was reviewed by the Base Closure Executive Group (Executive Group), a group of seven general officers and six Senior Executive Service career civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The decision to realign Griffiss AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the Executive Group.

**Return on Investment:** The cost to realign is estimated to be \$120.8 million; the annual savings after realignment are \$39.2 million; the return on investment years based on the net present value computations is 3 years. All dollar amounts are in constant FY 94 dollars.

**Impacts:** The Air Force will actively pursue conversion to a civil airport, and will dispose of all property not required at Griffiss AFB. The realignment of Griffiss AFB will have an impact on the local economy. The projected potential employment loss, both direct and indirect, is 7.6 percent of the employment base in the Utica-Rome



Metropolitan Statistical Area, assuming no economic recovery. There is no significant environmental impact resulting from this closure. Generation of hazardous wastes and pollutants will be eliminated. Griffiss AFB is on the National Priorities List. Environmental restoration of Griffiss AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at receiving bases is not significant.

### **Changes To 1988 Base Closure Commission Recommendations**

Bases identified by the 1988 Base Closure Commission as receiving bases were evaluated by mission category along with all other bases in the United States. As part of this review, the 1988 Commission's realignment recommendations were evaluated against recent force structure reductions, as well as, opportunities to operate more efficiently and effectively. The Air Force recommended changes result from analysis of changing world order, other base closures, the threat and force structure plan, and budgetary reality. The Air Force continues to implement the closure of the five bases recommended by the 1988 Commission.

#### **Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois**

**Recommendation:** As part of the closure of Chanute AFB, Illinois, the Air Force recommends consolidating its 16 Metals Technology, Non-Destructive Inspection, and Aircraft Structural Maintenance training courses with the Navy at Naval Air Station (NAS) Memphis, Tennessee, and then move with the Navy when NAS Memphis closes. The 1991 Base Closure Commission recommended that these courses, along with 36 other courses, be transferred to Sheppard AFB, Texas.

**Justification:** On March 31, 1992, the DoD Inspector General recommended that the Air Force consolidate and collocate its 16 metals training courses with the Navy. There will be no Military Construction (MILCON) costs associated with temporarily relocating the specified training courses to NAS Memphis. This is considerably less than the \$17.5 million in MILCON cost to relocate these courses to Sheppard AFB. As this training is now scheduled to move when NAS Memphis closes, the Air Force and Navy will work to achieve a cost effective approach until a more permanent site is found. Collocation of these courses with the Navy will achieve efficiencies and savings.

**Impacts:** There is no significant environmental impact resulting from this change. Environmental restoration of Chanute AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at the new receiving base is not significant.

## **Changes To 1991 Base Closure Commission Recommendations**

Bases identified by the 1991 Base Closure Commission as realignment receivers were evaluated by mission category along with all other bases in the United States. As part of this review, the 1991 Commission's realignment recommendations were evaluated against recent force structure reductions, as well as opportunities to operate more efficiently and effectively. The Air Force recommended changes result from analysis of changing world order, other base closures, threat and force structure plan, and budgetary reality. The Air Force continues to implement the closure and realignment of the bases recommended by the 1991 Commission.

### **Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas**

**Recommendation:** Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Bergstrom AFB as follows: The 704th Fighter Squadron (AFRES) with its F-16 aircraft and the 924th Fighter Group (AFRES) support units will move to Carswell AFB, Texas and the cantonment area at Bergstrom AFB will close. The Regional Corrosion Control Facility at Bergstrom AFB will be closed by September 30, 1994, unless a civilian airport authority elects to assume the responsibility for operating and maintaining the facility before that date.

**Justification:** The 1991 Commission recommended the closure of Bergstrom AFB. The AFRES was to remain in a cantonment area. In reviewing AFRES plans for Bergstrom AFB, the Air Force found that considerable savings could be realized by realigning the Bergstrom AFRES units and aircraft to the Carswell AFB cantonment area. This realignment will result in savings in Military Construction (MILCON) funds, reduced manpower costs, and will not significantly impact unit readiness. The original 1991 realignment recommendation cost \$12.5 million in MILCON to construct a cantonment area at Bergstrom AFB. Based on the best estimates available at this time, the cost of this change is \$5.8 million in MILCON, for a projected savings of \$6.7 million. This action will also result in net manpower savings.

**Impacts:** There is no significant environmental impact resulting from this change. Environmental restoration of Bergstrom AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at the new receiving base is not significant.

### **Carswell Air Force Base, Texas**

**Recommendation:** Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Carswell AFB as follows: Transfer the fabrication function of the 436th Training Squadron (formerly 436th Strategic Training Squadron) to Luke AFB, Arizona and the maintenance training function to Hill AFB, Utah. The remaining functions of the 436th Training Squadron will still relocate to Dyess AFB, Texas. Final disposition of the base exchange and commissary will depend on the outcome of the Congressionally mandated base exchange and commissary test program.

**Justification:** The 1991 Commission recommended that the 436th Training Squadron be relocated to Dyess AFB as a whole. The proposed action will result in more streamlined and efficient training operations. Transferring the fabrication function to Luke AFB will avoid duplicating this function within Air Combat Command. The Hill AFB move will ensure that maintenance training is provided in a more efficient manner.

The original 1991 realignment cost was \$1.8 million in Military Construction (MILCON). The cost for this redirect is \$0.3 million MILCON, for a projected savings of \$1.5 million MILCON.

**Impacts:** There is no significant environmental impact resulting from this change. Environmental restoration of Carswell AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at the new receiving bases is not significant.

### **Castle Air Force Base, California**

**Recommendation:** Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Castle AFB as follows: Redirect the B-52 and KC-135 Combat Crew Training mission from Fairchild AFB, Washington to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana (B-52) and Altus AFB, Oklahoma (KC-135).

**Justification:** The force structure upon which the 1991 Commission based its recommendations has changed and B-52 force structure is being reduced. The Air Force currently plans to base a large number of B-52s at two locations, with Barksdale AFB serving as the hub for B-52 operations and training. Similarly, training for mobility operations is being centralized at Altus AFB. This redirect will reduce the number of training sites and improve efficiency of operations.

The original 1991 realignment recommendation cost \$78.7 million in Military Construction (MILCON). The estimated cost for this redirect to Barksdale and Altus AFBs is \$59.5 million in MILCON, for a projected savings of \$19.2 million.

**Impacts:** There is no significant environmental impact resulting from this change. Environmental restoration of Castle AFB will continue until complete. The impact on the community infrastructure at the new receiving base is not significant.

### **MacDill Air Force Base, Florida**

**Recommendation:** Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding MacDill as follows: The Air Force Reserve (AFRES) will temporarily operate the airfield as a reserve base, not open to civil use, until it can be converted to a civil airport. This will accommodate the recommended reassignment of the 482nd Fighter Wing (AFRES) from Homestead AFB to MacDill AFB and its conversion to KC-135 tankers. The Joint Communications Support Element (JCSE) will not be transferred to Charleston AFB, South Carolina as recommended in 1991, but, instead, will remain at MacDill AFB.

**Justification:** The 1991 Commission recommended a realignment and partial closure of MacDill AFB. Its F-16 training mission has been relocated to Luke AFB, Arizona, and the JCSE was to be relocated to Charleston AFB. Two unified commands, Headquarters Central Command and Headquarters Special Operations Command, were left in place. The airfield was to close.

Several events since 1991 have made a change to the Commission action appropriate. The closure of Homestead AFB requires the relocation of the 482nd Fighter Wing (AFRES). The best location for this unit, when converted to KC-135s, is MacDill AFB. The National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) aircraft element has relocated from Miami International Airport to MacDill AFB and would like to remain permanently. NOAA is prepared to pay a fair share of the cost of airport operations.

The AFRES's temporary operation of the airfield will have reduced operating hours and services. The 1991 Commission noted a number of deficiencies of MacDill AFB as a fighter base: "pressure on air space, training areas, and low level routes...not located near Army units that will offer joint training opportunities...[and]... ground encroachment." These are largely inapplicable to an AFRES tanker operation.

Encroachment remains a problem, but the reduced number of flights and the increased compatibility of both tanker and NOAA aircraft with the predominant types of aircraft using Tampa International Airport make this viable. As an interim Reserve/NOAA airfield, use will be modest, and it will not be open to large-scale use by other military units.

The original 1991 realignment recommendation cost for the JCSE relocation was \$25.6 million in MILCON. Retaining the JCSE at MacDill AFB avoids this cost.

**Impacts:** The Air Force will continue to encourage transition of the airfield to a civil airport, and, if successful, DoD units could remain as cost sharing tenants. The environmental impact and the impact on the community infrastructure is not significant.

#### **Mather Air Force Base, California**

**Recommendation:** Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Mather AFB as follows: Redirect the 940th Air Refueling Group (AFRES) with its KC-135 aircraft to Beale AFB, California vice McClellan AFB, California. Because of the rapidly approaching closure of Mather AFB, the 940th will temporarily relocate to McClellan AFB, while awaiting permanent beddown at Beale AFB.

**Justification:** Moving the 940th Air Refueling Group (AFRES) to Beale AFB is more cost effective.

The original 1991 realignment cost was \$33.7 million in Military Construction (MILCON). The estimated cost for this redirect is \$12.5 million in MILCON, for a projected savings of \$21.2 million.

**Impacts:** The environmental impact and the impact on the receiving community infrastructure are minimal. Environmental restoration at Mather AFB will continue until complete.

#### **Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base (ANGB), Ohio**

**Recommendation:** Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Rickenbacker ANGB as follows: The 121st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) and the 160th Air Refueling Group (ANG) will move into a cantonment area on the present Rickenbacker ANGB, and operate as a tenant of the Rickenbacker Port Authority

(RPA) on RPA's airport. The 907th Airlift Group (AFRES) will realign to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio as originally recommended. The 4950th Test Wing will still move to Edwards AFB, California.

**Justification:** The 1991 Commission recommended closing Rickenbacker ANGB, and realigning the 121st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), the 160th Air Refueling Group (ANG) and the 907th Airlift Group (AFRES) to Wright-Patterson AFB. These units were to occupy facilities being vacated by the 4950th Test Wing, which will move to Edwards AFB to consolidate test units.

The airfield at Rickenbacker is no longer a military responsibility, having been transferred by long term lease to the RPA in 1992. It will be conveyed in fee under the public benefit authority of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 when environmental restoration is complete. The State of Ohio has proposed that under current circumstances, more money could be saved by leaving the ANG tanker units at Rickenbacker ANGB than by moving it to Wright-Patterson AFB. The Air Force has carefully examined his analysis and concluded that it is correct. The current analysis is less costly than the original estimate of moving both Rickenbacker ANGB units to Wright-Patterson AFB, primarily because of the State's later burden-sharing proposal to lower the ANG's long-term operating costs at Rickenbacker.

In a related force structure move, in order to fully utilize the facilities at Wright-Patterson AFB, the Air Force recommends that the 178th Fighter Group move from the Springfield Municipal Airport, Ohio, to Wright-Patterson AFB, about 30 miles away. This unit will fit into the available facilities with little construction. The move will save approximately \$1.1 million in base operating support annually based on economies of consolidating some ANG functions with AFRES and active Air Force functions at Wright-Patterson. Since the unit moves only a short distance, retention of current personnel should not be a problem.

The 4950th will still move to Edwards AFB, California from Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, to take advantage of the enhanced military value through the efficiency of consolidating test assets.

The original 1991 realignment cost was \$37.9 million in Military Construction (MILCON). The cost for this redirect is \$26.2 million in MILCON, for a projected savings of \$11.7 million.

**Impacts:** The environmental impact and the impact on the receiving community infrastructure are minimal.